2016-2017 Year-End Committee Report Form

Committee: Professional Standards

Chair: Kenneth Peter	**Chair-Elect for 2017-2018**: Kenneth Peter 45562 0119 (Please include phone/zip/email if available)
Number of Meeting held: 18	

Items of Business Completed 2016/2017

1. Reviewed 8 sets of department RTP guidelines

2. Faculty Intellectual Property: White Paper and SOS resolution

3. S17-2 Adopting new SOTE and SOLATE Instruments

4. S15-7 Amendment E Removal of Stray clause

5. S15-6 Amendment B Composition of Recruitment Committees

6.

Unfinished Business Items from 2016/2017

1. Chairs and Diretors Policy ongoing negotiations with Administration

2. Information Privacy Policy awaiting Presidential signature

3. BAFPR Policy Update

New Business Items for 2017/2018

1. RTP Amendment: Department Chairs Chairing RTP Committees

2.

3.

Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by May 31, 2017.

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 1: August 29, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat A: Elna Green

1. Call to Order and introductions of members
2. Review of work for the year ahead
3. Report from IEA on implementation of Office Hours Policy (2:30 Time Certain; Scott Heil, report attached.)
4. Review of Anthropology Department proposed RTP guidelines (attached.)
5. Review of School of Nursing proposed RTP guidelines (attached.)
6. Explanation and forwarding of FERP RTP amendments to S15-7 to allow full Senate consideration (attached.)
7. Discussion of amendments to update the Assigned Time policy S15-7 (attached.)
8. Discussion of amendments to update the Chairs and Directors policy S14-8 (attached.)
9. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 2: September 12, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat B: Sang Lee

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of August 29.
3. Discussion of amendments to update the Assigned Time policy S15-7 (attached.) Shall Professional Standards send these amendments to the Senate as a Final Reading item for its meeting on September 24?
4. Discussion of amendments to update the Chairs and Directors policy S14-8 (attached.) Shall Professional Standards send this to UCCD for feedback?
5. Review of status of all Department guidelines:
   a. Submitted, reviewed by PS, approved by FA, on the website:
      - School of Information
      - NUFS
      - English
   b. Submitted, reviewed by PS, revised, not yet approved by FA
      - Nursing; reviewed a second time and returned for more revisions
      - Occupational Therapy (service component approved, scholarship component under revision; OT has no one going forward this year so will take some time to revise.
   c. Submitted, reviewed by PS, not yet revised and resubmitted to FA
      - Anthropology
      - Engineering—all departments
      - Library *required*
      - Counseling *required*
      - Music and Dance
      - Journalism and Mass Comm
      - Justice Studies

6. Preliminary discussion of recent Title IX case which appeared in the media; invitation to Kathleen Wong(Lau) to attend a future meeting.

7. Begin discussion: F81-7 Appointment of Grant Related Instruction Faculty (GRIF). Does this policy need revision? If so, how?
8. Continue discussion of S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information. How should this policy be revised?
9. Issue: how to populate recruitment committees for interdisciplinary positions? S15-6.
10. Issue of populating department RTP committees and the feasibility of using secret ballots. Issue the Deans have discussed. The Deans (via Dean Chin) report that 16 departments cannot staff their own RTP committees without borrowing faculty, and they don't understand how to do secret ballots under those circumstances.
11. Issue of Department Chairs Chairing RTP committees. Lynda Heiden, UCCD Chair, wants more flexibility.
12. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 3: September 19, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat C: Carole Reade

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of September 12.
3. Discussion of amendments to update the Chairs and Directors policy S14-8 (attached.) Shall Professional Standards send this to UCCD for feedback?
4. Continue discussion of S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information. How should this policy be revised?
5. Amending S15-6, Appointments, to provide more flexibility in the structure of recruitment committees.
6. Discussion: Faculty Diversity efforts
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 4: October 3, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat D: (Vacant—would Judith be willing?)

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of September 19.
3. Approval of Revised SOTE and SOLATE instruments. Shall PS recommend their approval at the October 24 Senate meeting?
4. Discussion of amendments to update the Chairs and Directors policy S14-8 Shall Professional Standards send this to UCCD for feedback?
5. Continue discussion of S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information. How should this policy be revised? Review of research.
6. Memo re: Best Practices for scheduling RTP committees. Shall PS and Faculty Affairs send this memo to Deans and Chairs?
7. Discussion: Implications of organizational restructuring for Faculty Affairs.
8. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 5: October 17, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat F: Paul Kauppila

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of October 3
3. Updates and introductions
    a. New member Roxana Marachi, Education
    b. New member Connie Hwang, Humanities and the Arts
    c. SOTE/SOLATE revisions on the way to the Senate for Final reading
    d. Chairs and Directors policy under review by UCCD
    e. BAFPR revision on hold due to reorganization.
    f. "Best practices for scheduling RTP" memo on hold for timely distribution
    g. Faculty Diversity Summit: plans
4. Discussion and advice: inability for form department RTP committees in two departments in the College of Education
5. Second review: Counseling RTP Guidelines
6. Second review: Library RTP Guidelines
7. Continue discussion of S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information. How should this policy be revised? Review of research.
8. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 6: November 7, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat F: Paul Kauppila

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of October 17 (?)
3. Updates and introductions
    a. SOTE/SOLATE passed Senate
    b. Chairs and Directors policy still under review by UCCD
    c. BAFPR revision on hold due to reorganization.
    d. EATC amendments finally signed by President
4. 2:00 time certain Kell Fujimoto, Counseling RTP Guidelines
    a. Read Counseling guidelines
5. 3:00 time certain Mike Cook discussion of S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information.
    a. Read: SJSU present policy (old) F97-7 with O&G amendments
    b. Read: CSU "Responsible use policy (CSU Section 8000—focus only on section 8105 with an eye for privacy protections, if any.)
    c. Read UC "Electronic Communications Policy" section IV only with an eye for privacy protections.
    d. Read AAUP "Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications" sections IX and X only.
6. Revisions of Recruitment Committee Composition Amendment
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 6: November 14, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat D: Roxana Marachi

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes ofNovember 7
3. Revisions of Recruitment Committee Composition Amendment
4. Information Privacy Policy
5. Diversity Resolution in response to election
6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 8: November 21, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat D: Roxana Marachi

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of November 14
3. Information Privacy Policy
4. Amendment RE: early decision
5. Updates and plan for future work
    a. Recruitment amendments passed the Senate
    b. Diversity Policy in need of update?
    c. BAFPR report
    d. Chairs and Directors?
    e. Post-tenure review
    f. Coordinator policy?
6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 9: December 5, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat G: Connie Hwang

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of November 28 (Marachi)
3. Updates and plan for future work
    a. Recruitment amendments passed the Senate
    b. Diversity Policy in need of update?
    c. BAFPR report?
    d. Chairs and Directors?
    e. Post-tenure review
    f. Coordinator policy?
    g. SOTES?
    h. Charge, Faculty Diversity Committee?
4. Follow up: early tenure discussion; results of consult with Provost, Elna's views.
5. Follow up: information privacy policy.
6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

January 30, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat A: Elna Green

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of December 5 (Hwang)
3. Updates
    a. The Library revised its guidelines in line with suggestions and Elna has accepted them. I see no reason for PS to look at them for a third time.
    b. Diversity Committee charge—still pending larger Diversity initiatives.
    c. BAFPR—has said it will have a draft for us by February.
    d. Coordinator policy—should we work on this?
4. Chairs and Directors Policy revisions. I met with UCCD on January 23 and received a great deal of practical advice. The attached draft reflects their suggestions.
5. SOTES. The President returned the SOTES policy for minor revisions. Emily Slusser, Chair of SERB, and I met with the Provost to determine the necessary changes. They have been made in this draft, which needs to go back to the Senate again.
6. Early tenure policy. The provost reviewed the draft and supports the concept, but Elna may have language adjustments.
7. Information Privacy Policy. Our latest draft was sent to the President for feedback and review. Feedback is promised but not yet delivered at the time I prepared the agenda; I will report on it if it comes in.
8. Guidelines for Direct Observations (F12-6). A question has arisen over whether departments are publishing their guidelines for direct observations (peer observations) of faculty, as required in F12-6, and whether those guidelines are being regularly reviewed or updated. Relevant language from the policy appears in section C.
9. Updates
10. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

February 6, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat B: Sang Lee

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of January 30 (Green)
3. Updates
    a. Faculty Diversity Committee has met and is suggesting a change in its composition and mission to the Diversity Task Force.
    b. Coordinator policy—no easy way to determine who the coordinators are, but we are in correspondence with IEA in an effort to do so.
    c. Information Privacy policy—still no detailed feedback. I have invited Jaye Bailey to come to talk to us.
    d. Early tenure policy has been delivered to the Senate office as a 1st reading for February 13.
4. 2:00 time certain. SOTES. Emily Slusser, Chair of SERB, will visit to discuss the draft with us.
5. Chairs and Directors Policy revisions. Continued discussion.
6. Questions for Department Coordinator survey—brainstorming.
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

February 20, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat C: Carol Reade

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of February 4 (Lee)
3. Updates
    a. Revised SOTE/SOLATEs passed and have been delivered to the President.
    b. Early tenure policy did not make it to discussion at the Senate due to a long agenda. Suggestion: move to final reading and notify Senate.
4. 2:15 time certain. Information Privacy draft: Jaye Bailey, Chief of Staff, to discuss strategies for this policy and its relation to a possible Presidential directive. The December draft is attached.
5. Chairs and Directors Policy revisions. Latest draft.
6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

March 6, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat D: Marachi

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of February 20 (Reade)
3. Shall Professional Standards send the Information Privacy policy forward to the Senate for a first reading on March 13
4. Shall Professional Standards send the Chairs and Directors policy forward to the Senate for a first reading on March 13
5. Guidelines review: Communication Studies
6. Guidelines review: Urbana and Regional Planning
7. Feedback on RSCA policy for C&R
8. Following through on Program Coordinators survey
9. Touching base on RTP issues:
    a. How is the conversion to online mini reviews going?
    b. Guidelines on the way….
    c. Late add question….
10. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

March 20, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat E: Hamedi-Hagh

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of March 6 (Marachi)
3. Guidelines review: Environmental Studies
4. Continued work on Information Privacy policy aimed at April 10 final reading.
5. Continued work on Chairs and Directors policy aimed at April 10 final reading.
6. Following through on Program Coordinators survey
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

April 3, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat F: Kauppila

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of March 20 (Hamedi-Hagh)
3. Continued work on Information Privacy policy aimed at April 10 final reading.
4. Continued work on Chairs and Directors policy aimed at April 10 final reading.
5. SOS on Intellectual Property
6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

April 17, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat G: Hwang

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of April 3 (Kauppila)
3. Discussion with Deans regarding 11 proposed amendments to the Chairs and Director's Policy. (Guests Schutten and Jacobs)
4. Anthropology Guidelines
5. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

April 24, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat H: White

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of April 3 (Kauppila) and April 17 (Hwang)
3. Anthropology Guidelines
4. Amendments to AS 1636
5. Planning for final meeting: May 8.
6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

May 8, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat J: Caesar

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of April 24 (White)
3. Updates:
    a. Anthropology Guidelines
    b. Chairs and Directors—Provost to attend future meeting to discuss
    c. Information Privacy—I was misinformed, the President has NOT yet signed.
4. Green: Referral from URTP Committee: evidence of journal quality and predatory journals
5. Plans for next year
6. Departures
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Minutes for 29 August 2016

Clark Hall 445; 2:00 to 4:00 pm.

Members in attendance: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Kauppila, Lee, Peter, Reade, Riley, White

Guests in attendance: Scott Heil (Director, Institutional Research), Judith Lessow Hurley (Honorary Senator), Michael Kimbarow (Senate Chair)

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00. Introductions of members.
2. Chair Peter summarized the work for the year ahead (policy revisions planned for BFR, SOTEs, IT, in addition to items on current agenda)
3. AVP Green provided brief update on implementation of eFaculty and RTP policies
4. Senate Chair Kimbarow welcomed the committee to the new academic year and thanked us for our service. Encouraged members to nominate candidates for open seats on the Senate Executive Committee.
5. Amendments to S15-7 to allow full Senate consideration of Executive Committee's actions in summer. Passed (8 yes, 1 abstain).
   2nd motion that Professional Standards Committee recommend to the Senate that it defeat the recommended changes also passed (7 yes, 2 abstain).
6. Report from Scott Heil of IEA on implementation of Office Hours policy. IEA conducted focus groups with students. Found no widespread dissatisfaction or student perception that faculty are not accessible or available to them. Students preferred email to F2F appointments for most questions. During peak times, office hours might be crowded (such as around exam periods). IEA is recommending no changes to the office hours policy at this time.
7. Review of Anthropology Department proposed RTP guidelines. The committee determined that there were enough changes desired and issues identified that the draft will be sent back to the Department for revision before submitting to the College RTP committee for its review.
8. Review of School of Nursing proposed RTP guidelines. The Committee determined that there were still issues of concern, and did not recommend that the AVP approve these guidelines without additional revision.
9. Brief review and discussion of need to revise the Assigned Time policy S15-1. Necessary because new Collective Bargaining Agreement extended the program, but our policy had a sunset provision. Committee agreed to submit

additional ideas and suggestions to Chair via email, with final vote to be taken at next PS meeting.

10. Amendments to update the Chairs and Directors policy S14-8. Committee will continue discussion of this policy at next meeting.
11. Adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Minutes submitted by Elna Green (Seat A)

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 2: September 12, 2016 @ Clark Hall 445

Attendance: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Kauppila, Lee (minutes), Peter (Chair), Reade, Riley, White, Lessow Hurley (Honorary Senator)

1. Call to Order @ 2:00 pm

2. Minutes of August 29 -- approved.

3. First RTP training session: Elna reports her experience of conducting the session. One issue Elna needs advice from PS committee is how to handle co-authorship in the department – particularly when co-authors are on the committee. There is potential conflict of interest and objective evaluation is questionable. If the members with co-authorship abstain, some department can be left without enough number of potential RTP committee members.

   Discussion:
   - If the work is peer reviewed, it would be okay. Non-peer reviewed work can be problematic and an external review may be needed.
   - The degree of co-authorship matters: When a large proportion of candidate's work is with the same person, and the person is on the RTP committee, it will result in less degree of faith in the next levels of review. The greater the overlap, the greater the need for an external review.
   - The dossier is due in couple of weeks for this review cycle and we can provide advisory language: There needs to be an acknowledgment that there is co-authorship and so the reviews in the next levels are aware of. External review can be suggested.
   - This kind of issue can be addressed in departmental guidelines.

4. Discussion of amendments to update the Assigned Time policy S15-7. Shall Professional Standards send these amendments to the Senate as a Final Reading item for its meeting on September 24? YES with 10-0-0
   Discussion: Keep November 15th deadline and add decision "no later than" end of January. Review committee members are mostly chairs so meetings in January would not be a problem. Decisions are needed before next AY schedules are set.

5. Discussion of amendments to update the Chairs and Directors policy S14-8. Shall Professional Standards send this to UCCD for feedback? Not yet. The committee reviewed and discussed sections 1 through 3 and will come back to the remainder sections. Ken will work on the revision based on our discussion.
   Discussion:
   2. 1. Who initiate the review of the incumbent? It needs stronger language about Dean's initiation.

2.1 Who gets to sign the petition for unscheduled review? Further clarification is needed about proportion language.
2.1. Remove "Except in rare instances and for compelling reasons"
3.1.1. Nominees for chair must <u>normally</u> be tenured faculty holding positions of Associate or Full Professor or equivalent at the time the appointment to Chair would become effective.
- This is not in complete agreement with the contract. Collective bargaining agreement (20.3.) allows tenured and probationary faculty and lecturers. Current policy limits opportunities to probationary faculty and lecturers.
- Add: "Except in rare instances and for compelling reasons" and remove "normally."
- Reverse the order: "Full or Associate professor".
- "Equivalent": Originally for the general units. General units do not have chairs as they do not have departments. This needs to be removed or clarified.

3.5. One "faculty" representative from the department: clarification is needed. Change to one member from the department RTP committee.

6. Review of status of all Department guidelines:
   a. Submitted, reviewed by PS, approved by FA, on the website:
      - School of Information
      - NUFS
      - English
   b. Submitted, reviewed by PS, revised, not yet approved by FA
      - Nursing; reviewed a second time and returned for more revisions
      - Occupational Therapy (service component approved, scholarship component under revision; OT has no one going forward this year so will take some time to revise.
   c. Submitted, reviewed by PS, not yet revised and resubmitted to FA
      - Anthropology
      - Engineering—all departments
      - Library *required*
      - Counseling *required*
      - Music and Dance
      - Journalism and Mass Comm
      - Justice Studies

*Library and Counseling are required to have guidelines. If anyone is going forward this year, they are not in compliance with the policy. If a candidate decides to use the old policy, old guidelines are okay. But not having new guidelines limit options to the candidates.

7. Preliminary discussion of recent Title IX case which appeared in the media; invitation to Kathleen Wong (Lau) to attend a future meeting.
   <u>Discussion</u>:
   - Title IX. Gender equity and sexual harassment cases.
   - (1) Why was prior allegation of sexual harassment not known?; and (2) why did this person continue to serve as the department chair after the initial investigation?
   - Is this kind of problem systemic or unique?

- This is about faculty rights and professional standards. Constructive solutions needs to be discussed in the PS committee.
- CSU system-wide executive order exists but there is no separate SJSU campus policy. Our infrastructure is really thin: Currently no Title IX officer. We need 3-4 coordinators in addition to the officer.

8. Begin discussion: F81-7 Appointment of Grant Related Instruction Faculty (GRIF). Does this policy need revision? If so, how?
   Discussion:
   - Not the highest urgency. Does not broadly affect the campus -currently affecting two faculty members.
   - The policy needs updates in accordance with the CSU policy: e.g., GRIF policy allows 20-25% additional income vs. CSU policy allows up to 35%.
   - Elna will bring more specifics to a future meeting.

9. Issue: how to populate recruitment committees for interdisciplinary positions? S15-6.
   - The issue is also extended to forming RTP committees.
   - Interdisciplinary positions do not belong to a single department.
   - Give a department permission to use a member from outside?

10. Issue of populating department RTP committees and the feasibility of using secret ballots. Issue the Deans have discussed. The Deans (via Dean Chin) report that 16 departments cannot staff their own RTP committees without borrowing faculty, and they don't understand how to do secret ballots under those circumstances.
    - PS committee needs more understanding about the core issues of the problem.

11. Issue of Department Chairs Chairing RTP committees. Lynda Heiden, UCCD Chair, wants more flexibility.
    - Will be discussed in the future meeting

12. Adjourn @ 4:05pm

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes
September 19, 2016

Clark Hall 445, 2:00p to 4:00p

Attendance: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Kauppila, Lee, Peter (Chair), Reade (minutes), White, Lessow Hurley (Honorary Senator)

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00p.

2. Minutes of September 12: adopted

3. Continued discussion of amendments to update the Chairs and Directors policy S14-8. Discussed proposed revision of Section 3.1 on Chair nominee requirements, against concerns over the vulnerability of junior faculty in the chair role. AVP Green to consult with administration regarding proposed revised language. Section 3.5, discussion about the pros and cons of making the voting results public, with the concern that assistant professors might be recognized particularly in small departments. The general sentiment was that voting results should be made public. Also in Section 3.5, need clarification that the College RTP committee member is not from the same department as the chair candidate. Section 4.2, add 'normally' to the interim chair coming from the same department. Discussion of Section 8.1, need more clarity around due process. Chair Peter to make further revisions based on PS discussion. PS will review again before it is sent to UCCD for feedback.

4. Discussed S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information, if and how this policy should be revised. The spirit of the policy is to protect privacy to the maximum extent possible under state and federal laws. The policy is old. Does it need to be revised, and if so, how? Discussion on whether the policy should be kept, and whether the wording should be updated. A question arose about authorization, that is, can the President alone, for instance, authorize email checks. Should there be checks and balances put into place, i.e. having more than one administrator be responsible for authorization? A task force (AVP Green and Honorary Senator Lessow Hurley) will search for relevant polices as guidance. The issue is not pressing and is placed on the backburner for now.

5. Discussed amending S15-6, Appointments, to provide more flexibility in the structure of recruitment committees. AVP Green explained the need for recruitment committees to have the flexibility to get enough members

with the requisite expertise by getting members outside the department. Also discussed were cases where faculty are hired for programs that are not housed in departments. The amended wording provides a mechanism especially for small departments to get members outside the department who are willing to serve and to broaden the expertise or composition of the committee. Members agreed to put this forward to the Senate during October for a first reading.

6. Discussed faculty diversity efforts and how PS might be involved, against the background of an interest by the Provost to redouble our efforts on faculty diversity. AVP Green has been tracking new faculty hire data; last year of 68 positions, 15 Asian/Asian American, 1 African American, 3 Hispanic, 38 white, 11 not yet specified. AVP Green pointed out that our existing diversity language in recruitment documents is quite comprehensive. Student Senator Caesar mentioned that discussions in the Diversity Committee have focused lately on retaining faculty of color, such as providing a welcoming environment. More data is needed to ascertain the specific issues, for instance, resources, campus climate, support of academic programs, composition of the search committees, regional bias, etc. that might affect recruitment and retaining of faculty of color. Chair Peter suggested that it would be useful to get a group of people together to discuss these issues with data. AVP Green mentioned that the latest round of data collected from new hire surveys (90-95% response rate) is being processed.

7. Adjourned at 4:03p

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes
October 3, 2016

Clark Hall 445, 2:00p to 4:00p

Attendance: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh (minutes), Kauppila, Lee, Peter (Chair), Reade, White

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00p.

2. Minutes of September 19: approved 8-0-0.

3. Discussions and actions of Revised SOTE and SOLATE instruments.
   This was first brought to the Professional and Standards committee in April. Committee asked for a few changes. SERB has removed the information items out of the SOTES and SOLATES and has returned a draft that has some wording changes on the main questions. The Professional and Standards committee is asked to approve the new version so that they can be used in Spring.
   There were a few discussions on the wording of performance versus effectiveness. The choice of not applicable/no opportunity to observe for question 13 in SOTE and question 9 in SOLATE might not be applicable. Because of online process, the line that asks students to use a space to elaborate on their responses might not be appropriate. It was also pointed out that addressing diversity is an important issue at school and the new SOTE and SOLATE do not evaluate those.
   The Professional and Standard committee recommend to forward the current SOTE and SOLATE drafts to the October 24 Senate meeting. Approved 8-0-0.

4. Discussion of amendments to update the Chairs and Directors policy S14-8
   The Professional and Standard committee discussed this policy in detail during the last meeting. There was a discussion on selection of chair and interim chairs in sections IV and V. The title of section VI will be revised to reflect the items addressed in the other sections.
   The Professional and Standards committee will send this to Dr. Heiden at UCCD for feedback. Approved 8-0-0.

5. Continue discussion of S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information.
   One of the major unaddressed concerns is the use of non-campus email by students in people soft and canvas. This violates FERPA and there is no provision to prevent it. The merits of adopting a guideline similar to those implemented by University of California systems were discussed. Committee feels there is a need to address the privacy of electronic information. However, the university information technology members are interested to have access liberty to private emails of faculty and staff. President Papazian might issue a directive to grant such a liberty.
   The Professional and Standards committee suggest that the privacy of electronic information must be revised similar to that adopted by university of California systems. The chair of the Professional and Standards committee will contact Mr. Cook and university president to reflect the concern.

6. Memo re: Best Practices for scheduling RTP committees
   Dr. Green and Dr. Peter have created this guideline to help with departments having difficulties to come up with an RTP meeting schedules that works for all members of the RTP committee. The issues involved with creating a committee from two department and other challenges facing small departments were discussed. It might be too late for this semester to send the drafted memo to Deans and Chairs. Instead, a more specific memo that offers schedule flexibility will be prepared by the chair of the Professional and Standards committee and will be forwarded to specific departments by Faculty Affairs.

7. Discussion: Implications of organizational restructuring for Faculty Affairs.
   Under new directives, some divisions of human resources and faculty affairs will be administered by the new vice president and chief of staff Jay Bailey. Traditionally, these two departments were under administration and finance and academic affairs. It is unclear how the faculty leave of absence, medical leave, development, paternity and maternity leaves will be coordinated. Provost will still administer some faculty related business such as sabbatical, hiring and RTP.

8. Adjourn at 4:00 pm

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 5: October 17, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat U: Brandon White

Present: Elna Green, Sang Lee, Carol Reade, Roxanna Marachi, Sotoudeh Hamedi-Hagh, Paul Kauppila, Connie Hwang, Brandon White, Kenneth Peter, and Skylar Caesar

Absent: None

1. Call to Order 2:03pm
2. Introductions of new members
    a. New member Roxana Marachi, Education
    b. New member Connie Hwang, Humanities and the Arts
3. Approved Minutes of October 3. 8-0-2
4. Updates
    a. SOTE/SOLATE revisions on the way to the Senate for Final reading…SERB still working on the more controversial parts that may come forward to the Senate in the spring.
    b. Chairs and Directors policy under review by UCCD
    c. BAFPR revision on hold due to reorganization. Senator Peter will meet with Jay to discuss this and what implications there are under the new reorganization. Where should board report?
    d. "Best practices for scheduling RTP" memo on hold for timely distribution
    e. Faculty Diversity Summit: got acquainted and informal discussion and will have future discussions. Various faculty and chairs of committees met with new VP and Provost.
5. Discussion and advice: inability for form department RTP committees in two departments in the College of Education
    a. 13 faculty who all refuse for various reasons to serve. See email discussion from Elna and Ken.

b. Provisions in policy for conflict of interest in policy that should address the two faculty who refuse to serve for conflict of interest.
c. Suggestion is to have one combined committee for the two departments. However, the departments did not structure it this way and with the conflicts of interest this makes it very complicated.
d. Numerous departments on campus that have similar issues going forward that could continue to cause problems.
e. Letter from Faculty Affairs (AVP, Elna) to all eligible faculty to serve on this committee reminding them that if elected, it is the ultimate professional responsibility and that if a committee is not formed, review will proceed without a department review. Letter should also remind that chairs can be elected to serve on committee or provide separate evaluation if a committee is not formed with the exception of the department who has an MPP (Associate Dean) currently as chair. Also letter would discuss a revised RTP calendar as needed.

6. Second review: Counseling RTP Guidelines
    a. No vote from the department on these guidelines.
    b. Guidelines do not distinguishing where they quote the policy vs. supplementing the policy. Cannot mix the two together.
        i. Section C.2.l
    c. Section D may be redundant with policy because it uses the same language.
    d. Does maintaining of state licensure (or obtaining) fall under Professional achievement or is it better to be placed under academic assignment?
    e. Page 7, how do you evaluate "attendance" of a professional workshop.
    f. Academic effectiveness, question about obtaining state licensure which is required to be ultimately be a counselor and does this fall under baseline or good?
    g. Invitation to Kal to discuss these guidelines since no one is going up this year from counseling that will be using these guidelines.

7. Second review: Library RTP Guidelines
    a. Department vote is not clear.
    b. Library is not a college, there is no policy on campus that gives them this title. They are considered a general unit.
    c. Fix II.A…primary assignment is more than academic assignment.
    d. Recommend provisional approval of guidelines provided that A and C are addressed (not B). Calendar may need to be extended if some librarians choose to use this guideline. Motion passes.

8. Continue discussion of S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information. How should this policy be revised? Review of research.
    a. Section IV of the UC policy seems pretty good. Sent to President and Mike Cook but no feedback yet.
    b. GMAIL vs CANVAS Mail (students do not use their official account; how do you get students to use the official email)
    c. Why isn't this in the CSU Responsible Use Policy?
    d. Next steps, invite Mike Cook and IT person to our next meeting.
9. Adjourn at 3:40pm

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – November 7, 2016 2:00PM-4:00PM

Clark 445

Chair: Ken Peter

Present: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Hwang, Kauppila, Lessow-Hurley, Marachi, White

1. Minutes of the Oct. 17 meeting were approved.

2. Kell Fujimoto of Counseling was a guest of the committee to answer questions about Counselors' RTP guidelines. Along with the Library, Counseling is one of two "special" academic units required to have separate guidelines for Academic Assignment under the new 2015 campus RTP policy. Both units had to revise their guidelines to match the new RTP policy.

   Current promotion and tenure candidates in Counseling are using the old policy, S98-8. However, new counselors that will be hired next year must use the new policy.

   Fujimoto then gave a brief overview of the licensing procedure for counselors. Newly hired counselors are expected to either have the proper licensing when hired, or to obtain the appropriate license(s) within one year of hiring. License not actually required but a good idea to have, both for the counselor and the university. Unlicensed counselors' activities are always supervised by licensed counselors.

   The committee recommended that counselors add more detail to the guidelines about the license requirement and about using the College of Social Sciences RTP committee if not enough counselors of the appropriate rank are available to staff the committee. The committee also recommended that information about voting results and a voting timeline be added to the guidelines.

   Counselors have a director (who is an administrator and not faculty.)

   A general discussion of SOCEs (Student Opinion of Counseling Effectiveness) followed. The IEA (Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics) collects SOCE data.

   The committee recommended several language changes: Change "augmented" to "elected," change "temporary" to "probationary," and remove "department" from the Excellent descriptor. Is just having the license enough to be baseline? If not, offer additional examples of scholarly achievement.

In the Service area, the committee recommended specifying "leadership" in the Good descriptor and adding "Cyberbullying" to the list of psychological issues. Counselor guidelines will be approved contingent upon revisions.

3. Updates:

   SOTE/SOLATE modifications passed the Senate.

   Chairs and Directors policy should be reviewed by UCCD (University Council of Chairs and Directors) in about two weeks.

   BAFPR (Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility) revision is currently on hold pending the president's administrative reorganization.

   EATC (assigned time for exceptional levels of service) was signed by the president but the window of time for faculty to apply is quite short.

   The committee then discussed revisions to the recruitment committee amendment, including a mention of diversity and other minor language changes.

4. Mike Cook of ITS (Information Technology Services) was a guest of the committee to discuss updating the university's Information Privacy Policy (S97-5.) The committee examined the CSU Responsible Use Policy, the University of California's Electronic Communications Policy, and the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) document "Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications." SJSU can only look at employees' email if there is a court order or a legal hold. Examining employee computer files *may* sometimes be necessary in certain situations (i.e., moving files from one server to another.) The committee asked who authorizes the viewing of employee computer files. The UC policy specifies this. Individuals are generally notified – at some point – that their files have been examined.

   The UC policy provides for a "review and appeal of actions taken." Should we create an annual report on actions taken (viewing of an individual's email, etc.)?

   Individual campus policies can be *more* restrictive than the CSU policy, but not less. However, going beyond what the CSU Responsible Use Policy already says would most likely engender resistance.

   The committee discussed a possible presidential directive requiring faculty and staff to use their SJSU email address. This is probably not practical or possible for students.

   FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) requests are sometimes redacted (cannot show names, addresses, grades, etc.) In cases of law enforcement investigations and litigation, individuals' emails *can* be examined without notifying the individual.

   A definition of "official university business" is needed. Faculty should be careful to separate research from advocacy. Faculty sometimes receive mixed messages, which can lead to differential treatment.

Should email forwarding be available to faculty? Forwarding email is frequently a violation of FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.)

Should SJSU get a custom Dropbox like Stanford has? Many faculty do not like to use Google Drive. It would be very expensive to add Dropbox as well…what is it worth to have an improved interface? Some departments currently use Dropbox, but Level 1 confidential data should not be stored there – Level 2 data might be OK.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Kauppila

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – November 14, 2:00PM-4:00PM

Clark 445

Present: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Kauppila, Lee, Lessow-Hurley (Guest), Marachi, Peter (Chair), Reade

I. Minutes of the Nov 7 meeting were approved.

II. S15-6 Composition of Recruitment Committee (Amendment):

Discussion of §3.2.2.

a. Committee changed the wording in the first sentence to “Preferably contain five or more members but never fewer than three members.

b. Committee noted the need to clarify the term “external election.” Committee agreed to a change of wording “Such an election is required if needed to achieve . . .”

c. Committee agreed to substitute “diversity” for “composition,” agreed to a suggestion to change “expertise or diversity of the committee” to “expertise and/or diversity of the committee.”

d. Typo noted: The department which will be home to THE prospective position.

e. It was noted that the dates in the rationale and the approval clause need to be updated, and also that voting roster be revised to reflect today’s vote.

f. General observations:

- It was noted that there was some confusion about §3.24. It is not the case that everyone always has to be tenured on every recruitment committee.
- There was discussion of a suggestion that the committee add alternative means to diversifying or expanding the membership, perhaps by adding EXO members. That constitutes a significant overhaul of the way things are done now. It was agreed that the amendment currently under consideration be sent forward at this time and that the issue of additional members be dealt with at a future time, perhaps when the committee has the result of the deliberations of the Diversity Committee.

III. Information Privacy Policy. Would rescind and replace existing F 97-7.

The draft prepared by Chair Peter is based largely on the UC policy. Unlike the CSU policy, which simply suggests that privacy should be respected, the UC policy has greater specificity and concrete checks and balances. The question is whether the committee would like to move forward with this.

Question about §2.3.7. It was suggested that the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility be the appeal body in the event of a disagreement about the right to privacy. AAUP recommends that a faculty body have oversight of the process. It was noted that ultimately the buck has to stop somewhere, a policy can only do so much, and at some point people have to have trust in the system.

The committee agreed that the policy be sent to Mike Cook (ITS) and President Papazian for feedback. It was suggested that it would undoubtedly appropriate to consult with the CIO when that person is in place.

IV. SOS: Reaffirming San Jose State University's Commitment to an Inclusive Campus Climate and Our Determination to Provide a Safe, Supportive and Welcoming Community.

The final version circulated at today's meeting is from the Senate Executive Committee. The intention is to send the SOS to the entire faculty for endorsement, with the hope that Associated Students and various staff associations will join in endorsing it.

The version circulated today has already been approved by the Executive Committee, therefore PS cannot amend it. The committee was, however, asked to vote on it as an endorsement. There was some conversation about changes to the wording. Chair Peter noted that members of the Senate can offer amendments on the Senate floor. Chair Peter asked that committee members who are not on the Senate email him with suggestions for potential amendments. A motion was moved and seconded and the SOS passed unanimously.

V. Chair Peter reminded the committee of upcoming business: The committee is waiting for feedback from the UCCD regarding the Chair's policy, the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility is considering its own organizational policy. Issues for the future include post-tenure review, office hour policy, selection of program coordinators.

VI. There was a conversation about the extent to which rebuttal letters submitted during the RTP process need to be circulated to lower levels of review, and the question was resolved by consulting the CBA which says that they do.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lessow-Hurley

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – November 28, 2:00PM-4:00PM

Clark 445

Present: Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh, Hwang, Lee, Marachi, Peter (Chair), Reade, White
Minutes taken by Marachi

1. Meeting was called to order at 2:01.
2. Minutes of November 14, 2016 were approved without changes.
3. Information Privacy Policy
    a. Discussion was held with analysis of written feedback provided by Information Security Officer Mike Cook
    b. Clarification was made that F97-7 had not been rescinded and is still enforced.
    c. Section 2.3.7 revisited regarding definition for procedural appeals
    d. There was a recommendation to add a section on notification before and/or after search has been conducted. Issues of consent were considered and a question arose regarding how the policy would apply (or not) if administration investigated members internally.
    e. Discussion included conditions of need for signoff by President (notes from M.C. suggested there were too many requests to expect personal participation in timely manner for every occasion). Suggestion was made to require signoff by Chief Information Officer and one or more of the following: Provost, the Vice President for Administration, the CSU General Counsel, Vice President for Organizational Development.
    f. It was suggested that an employee required to engage in a search should have option to opt out if contrary to policy or unethical in some other way.
    g. Discussion included use of various email accounts and whether or not there would be a presidential directive for faculty, students, etc. to use the university email system.
    h. K. Peter offered to make revisions to document to reflect changes discussed (see accompanying document for Dec. 5th meeting).

4. Amendment RE: Early Decision:
    a. Contract has limit of 2 years of service credit toward 6 years for tenure/promotion. To give up additional years can often be a deterrent for accepting offers so transferring faculty can apply for early Tenure. Old policy was ambiguous about standards required for early promotion/tenure. New policy is more rigorous with higher bar to meet. Discussion ensued regarding standards for going up in normal (422 or 332) or "early" cycle (442) (where 4 = Excellent, 3 = Good 2 = Baseline). Question arose regarding need for appointment letter to specify whether tenure is comparable or not (putting task on hiring and RTP committee). K. Peter offered to revise Amendment according to discussion and Item will be revisited at future meeting.

5. Following agenda items not addressed 11/21 to be moved to next meeting(s)
    a. *Recruitment amendments passed the Senate*
    b. *Diversity Policy in need of update?*
    c. *BAFPR report*
    d. *Chairs and Directors?*
    e. *Post-tenure review*
    f. *Coordinator policy?*

6. Meeting adjourned at 4:00.

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES–December 5, 2:00PM-4:00PM, Clark 445

Present: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Hwang, Lee, Lessow-Hurley (Guest), Marachi, Peter (Chair), Reade, White
Minutes taken by Hwang

1. Meeting was called to order at 2:01 PM.
2. Minutes of November 28, 2016 were approved without changes.
3. Updates and plan for future work
    a. Recruitment amendments passed the Senate
    Recruitment amendments have been approved by the president.

    b. Diversity policy
    The committee will update the policy next semester.

    c. BAFPR report
    Chair Peter will find out the current thinking from the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility on Thursday the 8th. The committee may need to help them with this decision, as they have not been able to arrive at any conclusions for the last two years.

    d. Chairs and Directors policy
    Chair Peter will attend UCCD's meeting on Wednesday the 7th, and will see if there's any further input. If there's no feedback, the committee will proceed without it, because the policy was drafted by the Committee early this semester, and we have yet to hear back.

    e. Post-tenure review
    Chair Peter provided a brief background on the current policy. The Board of Trustee insisted that reviews should be conducted, and concluded that the review outcomes might be too weak. Discussion also included the observation that not all submitted materials are the same among colleges, and recommended issuing an advanced timeline to notify the candidates of the review.

    f. Coordinator policy
    Discussion included defining who chooses coordinator, and the duties, as there's no current framework on this procedure.

    g. SOTES
    The president is returning the SOTES, and chair Peter is in touch with the Senate. There are some minor mistakes that need to be fixed and other ongoing discussion that might involve IEA and other entities. Old SOTES are continuing until these things have been addressed. The committee expects to hear back from Student Evaluation Review Board and will revise in Spring.

    h. The Faculty Diversity Committee needs to rewrite its charge. The committee needs to think of its active role and mission as operating committee. The committee will bring back the results to us hopefully this Spring.

Note: The menu to put down for the committee to work on in Spring:

- We will wait to hear from the operating committees: BAFPR, Diversity committee, and SERB, and we will act upon when they get back to us.
- We can decide if we could work on Diversity policy, Post-tenure review, and Coordinator policy, or whether we would like to do something else altogether.

4. The early tenured discussion
    a. Chair Peter met with the provost, the provost is not comfortable with the approach, though he did see the need to do so via an appointment letter. Elna stated that the appointment letter cannot be in conflict with the appointments policy.

    b. The committee recommends to define "comparable-level university" within the department level and would like to define the details. Also, a question was posed if we could "add a section in the appointment policy, determine whether the candidate will be eligible for the standard criteria (people had tenured somewhere else, and trying to get their tenured status as soon as possible when they get to SJSU)."

    c. We are thinking of moving the language over to the appointment's policy, to determine if the candidate will be under the old vs. new criteria. Chair Peter offered to revise Amendment after a discussion and the Item will be revisited at a future meeting.

5. Information privacy policy
    a. Old policy is vague, and out of compliance. The committee took UC's policy as a start point, and has left us in disagreement with Mike Cook.

    b. 1.5—There needs to be a clear info on who are the clear holders of these electronic communications. Brandon White suggested that we need to have a definition of where to get the consent from both the originator and the receiver of the digital communication. The committee discussed, and we decided it should be moved to section 2.

    c. Chair Peter revised the authorization section along Mike Cook's suggestions with compromises (Mike didn't mention emergency circumstances)—"Except for subpoenas or warrants, such actions (searches) must receive the advanced authorizations from the president, the president may re-delegate to allow such actions to be authorized by the dual approvals, of two following individuals—by the Provost, Vice President of Administration, CSU General of Counsels, Chief Information Officer (we have not hired yet), the Vice President for Organizational Development. The Information Officer may also approve such secondary authorization. All approvals should be recorded." Chair Peter will clarify that more than two individuals can authorize the search.

    d. 2.3.5—The first sentence—SJSU will implement a report to summarize an annual report on the searches (According to Mike, about 4–5 searches per year). The committee will let the president know that the committee is on the 3rd round of discussions with Mike, and this is what the committee proposes. We need advice from the President. The President and the Information Officer will provide guidance, and the committee can work accordingly.

    e. 2.3.7—Recourse—The President shall appoint a neutral official to receive complaints of violations of this policy. The official shall not be among those authorizing individuals listed in 2.3.1. Complaints shall be received and investigated per published procedures, with findings reported to the President and the individual issuing the complaint. The President shall determine resolution, consulting with General Counsel as necessary. A summary of complaints and their resolution will be included in the annual report (2.e.5). The committee would like to see a report of the searches and if there are any questions at that point, the committee recommends to go to executive committee to resolve the matter internally. In the long run, the President will have the ultimate decision on this.

    f. Chair Peter with send the discussion to the President. Chair Peter will revise 2.3.3 and will send everything forward to the President and Mike for now.

6. Meeting adjourned at 3:18 PM.

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes for 30 January 2017

Clark Hall 445 2:00-4:00 PM

Members Present: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Marachi, Lee, Hwang, Peter (Chair), Reade
Members Absent: Kauppila, White

Meeting was called to order at 2:05.

1. Minutes of 5 December 2016 approved as submitted.

2. Library guidelines. The Library revised its guidelines in line with suggestions from Professional Standards. Committee voted to recommend to AVP Green that they be approved.

3. Updates from Chair
    a. Diversity Committee charge—still pending larger Diversity initiatives. Task force is meeting this Wednesday. Chair will update Committee at next meeting.
    b. BAFPR—has said it will have a draft for us by February.

4. Coordinator policy. Committee agreed that coordinator roles vary widely across campus. We need to gather more information about them before we can decide on any policy proposals. Subcommittee comprised of Green, Hwang, Lee, and Peter will gather information. Subcommittee will solicit assistance from Scot Heil at IEA, and will devise a survey of chairs to inquire about departmental practices.

5. SOTES. Chair Peter reviewed background of policy and proposed revisions. Senate approved in October, but President returned proposal for corrections and revision. SERB has corrected errors, and responded to questions/issues.
    Committee discussed section of policy that referred to physical appearance. Recommended that the instructions section that refers to physical appearance be moved down to narrative comments section. Chair Peter will send this suggestion to chair of SERB.

6. Early tenure policy. The Provost reviewed the draft and supports the concept. Green suggested minor language adjustments. Committee voted unanimously to send to Senate for 1st reading. **8-0-0 (2 absent)**

7. Information Privacy Policy. Our latest draft was sent to the President for feedback and review. We are still awaiting response.

8. Guidelines for Direct Observations (F12-6). A question has arisen over whether departments are publishing their guidelines for direct observations (peer observations) of faculty, as required in F12-6, and whether those guidelines are being regularly reviewed or updated. Relevant language from the policy appears in section C.

   Committee agreed to have AVP Green prompt departments to comply, by asking Deans to call for submissions of guidelines. We suggest that department's personnel committee might design or draft. Any such guidelines still have to be voted on by department.

9. Chairs and Directors policy. Chair Peter met with UCCD to discuss current version of policy proposal. UCCD had numerous suggestions, now incorporated into draft. Committee began discussing one of the major issues—early reviews and faculty-initiated removal of chairs. We will return to this discussion at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:01 pm.

Minutes submitted by Green (Seat A)

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

February 6, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Members Present: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Marachi, Lee (Minutes), Peter (Chair), Reade, Lessow-Hurley (Guest), Kauppila, White, Hwang

1. Call to Order @ 2pm.

2. Approval of Minutes of January 30: approved.

3. SOTES. Emily Slusser, Chair of SERB, visits the PS committee to discuss the draft with us.
   - There was a concern about certain language added, "physical appearance of the instructors." Is it appropriate? It can introduce unconscious bias.
   - Emily Slusser explained that: There were complaints about comments related to physical appearance in the SOTES, which appear in their dossiers in the RTP process. Thus, the language of physical appearance was included in the instruction. Not including the particular language at all will be ignorance and negligence. Including the language also indicates that the administration is not interested in collecting such kind of information.
   - Discussion:
     - The rationale is understood but it is still concerning. How widespread are the comments about physical appearance? We don't have SJSU data. Other publicly available tools (e.g., ratemyprofessors.com) have questions about physical appearance.
     - SOTE Interpretation guide needs to be updated, including whether there is any systematic bias toward certain groups (e.g., gender).
     - Existing language already covers facility and physical condition. They are not supposed to be part of evaluating teaching effectiveness – like physical appearance.
     - Students are not well aware of the fact that SOTEs are placed on faculty's personal action files.
     - Things to consider in the future revision: (1) Clarification about "undue influence." Providing food in the last class session – can it be considered undue influence? ; (2) In SOLATE, Q4 is a triple-barreled question (Showed concern for student success in the course, and was accessible and responsive to students); and (3) Attention shift is needed from minor question adjustments to updating the interpretation guide.
   - Vote regarding a motion to adopt the current version as the final reading on February senate meeting: 9-0-1

4. Updates
    a. Faculty Diversity Committee has met and is suggesting a change in its composition and mission to the Diversity Task Force.
        - Faculty in residence is included in the diversity master plan passed in 2009. Assigned time is given to recruit diverse applicants in a faculty search process.
        - Faculty in residence in every college was suggested. Training for all faculty in residence and playing an advisory role in every faculty search were also suggested.
        - Negotiation with the administration about resources (e.g., assigned time) is needed. Revision of the committee structure and membership is also needed. Their role can be extend to help new faculty adjust in the role.
    b. Coordinator policy—no easy way to determine who the coordinators are, but we are in correspondence with IEA in an effort to do so.
        - No specific assigned time codes for the coordinators. But IEA can narrow down the relevant codes. Until we have that info, we would not know if we need the coordinator policy and, if needed, what kind.
    c. Information Privacy policy—still no detailed feedback. Ken have invited Jaye Bailey to come to talk to us in the next PS committee meeting.
        - On the matters that the President is directly responsible for, she wants to have it as a Presidential directive rather than a Senate policy.
        - In Jaye's visit, we can discuss how much is currently covered in the exiting senate policy.
    d. Early tenure policy has been delivered to the Senate office as a 1st reading for February 13.

5. Chairs and Directors Policy revisions. Continued discussion.
    - Lines 286~ : New language added about petition to early review, including both full and part-time faculty and the way to count. Signed petition will be kept confidential by the Dean.
    - Lines 371~: Selection of interim chair – transition (VI. 3). Clarification about the timeline is added. Is "permanent" chair correct term? Chairs are on the 4-year term so technically their position is not permanent. Replace "permanent" with "regularly appointed" of use abbreviations – e.g., IC. DC, AC.

    <u>Comments from the Deans</u>: Elna shared comments she received from the deans. The committee went through the list. Ken will address some minor language adjustments. Major items will be discussed in the next meetings. Elna will send the list of the comments. Some major comments are:
    - The current version includes both policy and procedural actions. Can the two be separated?
    - Section 1.9. Deans ought to have a place to make an independent recommendation. Current version only allows the Dean to not/approve the forwarded recommendation.

- How will a (review?) committee be selected?; how will the results be published; how will a Dean conclude that there is a reasonable likelihood that the second election will generate the majority vote?; how will the investigation process be held (section 2.4.)?; Which parameters and instruments will be used (section 4.5); what counts as an appropriate due process (section 8.1)?; it might be helpful to indicate that anonymity cannot be ensured. (section 1.4); all references to election should be "election of chair recommended" (section 1.3); having a requirement of three for counting members (in addition to two observers) (section 1.5); require the dean to "forward" the name, not just recommending the name forwarded by the department . Dean makes a separate recommendation; department should have a right to request for external search earlier in the process – in case the internal candidate(s) are not acceptable (but are elected) or there are multiple candidates to block a certain person to be elected. Department should have a right to invoke to an external search (section 2).

6. Questions for Department Coordinator survey—brainstorming. What nature of information do we want to gather?
    - Selection. How is the coordinator chosen? Appointed? Is the process open and transparent? What are the assigned time and compensation?
    - Scope of coordinator roles. Title? Coordinator of degree programs or concentrations. Accreditation issue.
    - Responsibilities between chairs and coordinators – e.g., scheduling. Degree of autonomy.
    - If not coming up with a policy, a white paper about the current status of coordinator positions can be considered.
    - Ken will start a draft of questions.

7. Adjourn @ 3:53pm

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes
February 20, 2017

Clark Hall 445, 2:00p to 4:00p

Attendance: Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Lee, Marachi, Peter (Chair), Reade (minutes), White, Lessow-Hurley (Honorary Senator)
Absent: Caesar, Kauppila, Hwang

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00p.

2. Minutes of February 06: adopted

3. Updates from Chair Peter: The revised SOTE/SOLATEs passed in the Senate and have been delivered to the President. The early tenure policy did not make it to discussion at the Senate due to a long agenda. Chair Peter suggested, and the committee agreed, that we schedule it as a final reading at the next Senate meeting in March.

4. Ahead of the 2:15p scheduled visit of Jaye Bailey, we reviewed the history of the S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information, and the impetus for the revisions that PS began last November. The spirit of the policy is to protect privacy to the maximum extent possible under state and federal laws. Questions raised about our current policy is whether it was too inflexible or not enough. We started to revise the draft in November based on UC policy. The President hesitated to relinquish authority over those matters for which she is responsible. An issue that arose was that there are people bound by the policy who are not represented on the Senate, so concern has been expressed about non-represented folks having a Senate policy imposed on them.

   At 2:15p Jaye Bailey, Chief of Staff, came to discuss the latest revised draft of S97-5 Privacy of Electronic Information, specifically its relation to a possible Presidential directive. She was accompanied by Mike Cook, Information Security.

   Jaye Bailey raised two issues: Information security, and non-university owned servers (which would go under a Presidential directive). These are not unique issues to SJSU. A few things jump out about our policy draft, from an administrative point of view. Regarding emails, the only time the administration looked into emails concerned misconduct; there is no other reason for looking at emails. Even so, misconduct has to go pretty far into the investigation before administration would look at emails. The CSU policy

seems to cover this in a flexible way. Particularly section 4.3 (Prohibition against monitoring and browsing). What was it about the CSU policy that is not acceptable?

Senator Peter responded that what the UC policy has that is lacking in the CSU policy are 'least perusal,' degree of accountability, and a reporting mechanism.

Jaye Bailey said that the President agrees that there should be very limited situations where emails would be checked. At the end of the day, however, everything we write is all public information. What we are trying to do here is to describe the culture that we respect. We do not want to create a 'liability arena' around the administration. Words such as bodily harm, etc. create a 'litigation arena.' You want to create a situation that is respectful, but do not want to suggest situations that do not exist. We do not know how the UC policy/language is implemented.

Senator Peter proposed writing up the policy to include a Presidential directive, and Jaye indicated that this might be a good way forward.

Senator Hamedi-Hagh raised the concern about protection from the President going into emails. Jaye Bailey says that it is taken care of in current CSU policy. Real abuse is to not only read emails but to create some case against individuals. Where you catch a President that has abused authority in this way is when the case comes forward. Staff, general counsel, collective bargaining, would stop this. These checks and balances are already built in. A question was raised about whether faculty would be informed that emails will be checked. Jaye Bailey responded with an example of a student allegation of sexual harassment. In that case would go in to check emails without telling faculty. Will tell faculty after the fact.

Senator Marachi raised the issue of false allegations, emails that come to you unsolicited that may not be accurate and could be damaging. Jaye Bailey indicated that issues of public access to email and what might be sent may not have been looked into at this stage. This would entail different conversations around securing access to email from the public.
Mike Cook suggested that it is better to use sjsu email for protection.
Ken: more concerned with information privacy than with focs on jobs

Senator Peter proposed an outline for moving forward: PS will draft a policy to include a statement of principles, least perusal, and accountability, without procedural details. Simultaneously Jaye and Mike could take on the procedural details. This was agreed by all, and appears to be a good

compromise. Jaye would like to do this as quickly as possible, to get substantially far along this semester.

For PS, we need to think of the essentials of principles that should go into the policy. Senator Peter suggested that we might want to re-read the AAUP document.

5. Reviewed and discussed the latest draft of a revised Chairs and Directors policy S14-8. The latest draft incorporates feedback from the UCCD and from Deans. The Deans each had very different views, eg, one wants more specificity while another wants less specificity.
   a) For instance, what process should be followed when no candidate gets a majority vote?
   b) Another issue raised by a Dean was about vetting with the personnel committee. This has been revised to say vetting with the department.
   c) Another Dean questioned why the Dean would have to leave the room when faculty discussion of a Chair takes place, so this has been revised to say that the Dean can stay if invited.
   d) Another issue is qualifications, and the use of 'tenured.' Agreement that it is preferable to have full professors, and possibly associate professors, but only under extenuating circumstances would an assistant professor be considered.
   e) External search for chair, 3.3. Revised to clarify external search, and can request it at the start of the process (rather than in the case of a failed search/election).
   f) Counting votes, consist of 3 individuals (instead of initially proposed 5). Made language longer to address a Dean's request for more specificity. Faculty observer if requested.
   g) Transparency to let faculty know the results of the vote.
   h) Chairs do many things beyond just transitioning the department to a regular chair.
   i) Add due process clause. Type of due process will vary depending on the alleged offense. If criminal activity, can immediately intervene to remove them as chair but not to terminate (which takes process).

   Will continue revising when PS meets again in 2 weeks.

6. Adjourned at 4:06p

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes
March 6th, 2017

Clark Hall 445, 2:00p to 4:00p

Attendance: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Hwang, Kauppila, Lee, Lessow-Hurley (Honorary Senator), Marachi (Minutes), Peter (Chair), White
Absent: Reade

1. Meeting was called to order at 2:03

2. Minutes of February 20th 2017 were adopted

3. Shall Committee send Information Privacy forward to Senate for a first reading on March 13th?

   Discussion: Reviewed Information Privacy document history and newly recommended policy. Discussion included attention to title from "Privacy of Privacy of Electronic Information" to "Principles Regarding Privacy of Electronic Information."

   Vote: 7 – Approved; 0 – Abstentions; 0 - Denials

4. Shall Professional Standards send the Chairs and Directors policy forward to the Senate for a first reading on March 13th?

   Discussion: Reviewed and discussed latest draft of revised Chairs and Directors policy S14-8. This draft incorporates feedback from the UCCD and from Deans. The Deans each had varying views related to specificity. Language discussed around qualifications section (2) and preference for full rank vs. inclusion of language for alternative ranks. Petition for early review (7.2 line 302) UCCD preferred counting temporary faculty the same or not counting at all. Report generated is created by review committee of permanent faculty and if need for removal would be by permanent faculty. Policy allows for voice of temporary faculty in processes/policies. Reviewed Section 9.3, revised language from "Transition to Permanent Chair" to "Transition to Regularly Appointed Chair." Chairs and Directors Policy was proposed to move forward to Senate for a first reading. White moved, Kauppila 2nded

   Vote 9 – 0 Vote to move forward

5. Feedback on RSCA policy for C&R
   Comments and concerns are as follows:
   a) that there may be conflicts that students sometimes face when they are simultaneously both employees on a grant and students earning units for the same activity. These two roles and related potential conflicts need to be resolved

   b) suggestion was made to consider language of S94-8 which prohibits any confidential research at SJSU.

c) NDA language in the new policy needs to be more clear. An NDA in which faculty agree not to divulge the technical details of cutting-edge equipment donated from a high tech company is common in Engineering and seems appropriate while an NDA which in any way restricts the academic freedom of a faculty member from sharing research whenever and with whoever seem inappropriate --even when voluntarily assented to.

d) discussed possible conflicts with F98-3 and the 1 vs. 2 policy conundrum. Some felt this belonged in two policies, some in one. Need to explore potential conflicts between the functions of the two parts of the policy, such as with item a (above).

Discussed inviting discussion around these issues. Need to specify why they would be replacing existing policies.

6. Following through on Program Coordinators Survey

   Questions and discussion focused on
   a) whether or not to start this year or next year;
   b) tasks required will be to construct a list of respondents and questions;
   c) who are the current targets - current Program Coordinators or anyone who ever served (or both)?;
   d) project will require that we define what "Coordinator" role requires. Is it tied to an academic program? Not just a piece of the curriculum of the program or is it being a coordinator *OF* the program?
   e) What resources do people get to do their jobs?
   f) Issue of compensation came up. Chairs are compensated in similar ways for their chair work. What are variations of compensation across coordinators?
   g) What is the coordinator's role in difficult contract issues? Does the chair take care of these roles for them or do they have similar responsibilities? Are they consulted or are they given job of doing it? Are there any safeguards for how they are doing the job?
   h) What responsibilities do Coordinators hold for staffing issues? What about staffing issues for graduation/enrollment?
   i) Important also to clarify Degree/Credential not just degree programs.
   j) Coordinators for some programs end up having to write massive documents. Have very little authority yet heavy responsibilities.
   k) What opportunities are there for training or ongoing professional development?
   l) Committee will attempt to construct survey and to administer it in Fall 2017.

7. RTP Guidelines - Department reviews
   RTP Guidelines for Communications Studies
   Discussion: Committee discussed need for greater clarity and specificity of expectations and examples. "Excellence in teaching" policy descriptor included some circular language. Unclear what is meant by higher level of curricular innovation. Discussed comparisons between university versus college related norms. Concern about vague language was that it may be a risk in creating grievances and problems. E. Green agreed to communicate feedback to Communication Studies Department.

RTP Guidelines for the Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Discussion: Committee members appreciated specificity. Discussed need to address what aspects of field study or field work are unique and what would constitute examples that would be considered "excellent" or "baseline" given these unique factors. Committee suggested elaborating on and including real profiles of accomplishments in that specific section. Also worth reviewing formatting for alignment with Accessibility Standards. Need to add date and vote at the top. Document is satisfactory and would benefit from minor revisions as indicated.

RTP continued:

a. How is the conversion to RTP online mini reviews going?

142 mini reviews had been submitted. Apparently not all faculty are aware that 2nd, 4th, 6th year pattern is gone. AY Summary of Achievements are being reviewed. All 1st years submitted, depending on the year they were hired. No 6th year people. A few minor glitches are being worked out regarding matches of schedules with census and enrollment shifts once data uploaded.

a. E. Green indicated Environmental Studies guidelines had been sentand will be forwarded for next meeting 3/20/17.
b. Late Add questions?

Professional Standards Committee

Minutes

March 20th, 2017

Clark Hall 445, 2:00p to 4:00p

Attendance: Caesar, Green, Hamedi-Hagh (Minutes), Kauppila, Lee, Marachi, Peter (Chair), Reade and White.

1. Call to Order at 2 pm.

2. Approval of Minutes of March 6 (Marachi): Approved.

3. Guidelines review: Environmental Studies

PS committee communicated about this through email last week. Section D of the guideline inspired a few questions among PS committee. Faculty in Environmental studies are very diverse and can have a mixture of peer reviewed and not reviewed scholarly activities. It is not obvious if publication requirements in section D are based on yearly achievement or longer period. It might be better that Section D is revised to be clearer. Providing typical profiles and examples will enable committee with better understanding of different possible scenarios that Environmental Study faculty might have. Furthermore, title of section B should change because it discusses comparable but non-peer reviewed works.

4. Continued work on Information Privacy policy aimed at April 10 final reading.

Some senators provided feedback about this policy during Academic Senate meeting last Monday. Looking at possible presidential order on this topic will be very helpful. We will forward this version of policy to chief of staff for input and will discuss it again after Spring break. The PS committee might present this policy to Academic Senate in April for final reading.

5. Continued work on Chairs and Directors policy aimed at April 10 final reading.

Comment: In section 2.0 sentence 2. Why is the Professional Standards Committee becoming involved in a discussion about the Chairperson's rank? This committee has no other roles in the Chairperson selection or review process. PS is a policy committee and should not be inserting itself into the process itself.

Action: The executive committee will be consulted to decide about this.

Comment: In section 3.1 chair responsibilities cannot be determined by departmental faculty. Department faculty may give input, but ultimately chair responsibilities have to be determined by the dean, provost, and president, and have to be in alignment with the CBA and other binding legislation. Example: Department faculty might want chair's job description to say that chair will assure that full professors get first choice of class assignments. This would be in conflict with the CBA. It is suggested that job descriptions should be vetted w/ chairs' councils in each college periodically to ensure they are up to date.

Action: The PS committee will modify the language of the policy to accommodate this.

Comment: In section 3.4 it might be helpful to establish that the dean's office is responsible for facilitating this meeting, especially to avoid a conflict of interest with an incumbent Chairperson who is seeking re-election.

Action: PS committee suggest to create an observer committee with representatives from department and dean's office to facilitate this.

Comment: In section 3.5 it might be helpful to establish that the dean's office is responsible for managing the election, especially to avoid a conflict of interest with an incumbent Chairperson who is seeking re-election.

Action: Same as above.

Comment: In section 3.6 the number of people required to count votes is still too cumbersome. Just finding a time for 5 people to meet at the same time is difficult. Having designated observers just seems unnecessary when the committee itself is so neutral. Can we just make it 2 faculty and a rep from the dean's office? Why isn't that enough? Has there actually been some question about vote counting? Is this a solution for a problem that doesn't exist?

Action: Same as above.

Comment: In section 4.1 department faculty may request an external search for department chair with the understanding that a successful search might have a negative impact on funding available for other recruitment."

There is no need to state it so negatively. It should just say: "Department faculty may request an external search for department chair."

Action: The language of the policy will change to replace the budget negativity.

Additional comment on section 4.1: Also--it's going to be very confusing to figure out when to authorize internal people to apply. Why can't we just leave that sentence out? If people want to apply they can. There is nothing that keeps them from applying now.

Action: none.

Additional comment on section 4.1: Departmental faculty should not be the only body able to recommend an external search for a chair. There could be compelling reasons why an external search is preferred by the Dean, Provost, or AVP for Faculty Affairs that would not necessarily resonate with the faculty - or might involve confidential issues that the faculty would not be privy to.

Action: The PS committee sees no remedy for this request.

Comment: In section 5.1 although the Dean and the Provost are afforded a presidential consultation in section 5.1, this consultation is neutralized in section 5.2. It might be better to include the Dean (and the Provost, as applicable) much earlier in the process so that the Dean can work collaboratively with a Department in its discussions about internal Chairperson candidates. Including the Dean earlier might also mitigate any "rare instances" or "compelling reasons" for the President to reject a Department's recommendation (section 5.2).

Action on section 5.1: The PS committee suggests any rejection of elected department chair by the administrators happen for valid reasons and not before giving an elected chair a reasonable amount of time to function.

Action on section 5.2: PS will revisit this next time.

Comment: In section 6.4 there may be any number of reasons why a Department needs to extend an interim chairperson's appointment other than "a failure of collegiality." If this statement remains, the text should defend this claim.

Action: The policy language will be revised.

Comment: In section 7.2 the policy might identify the length of time a Chairperson has served before a faculty initiated review is allowed. Reasonably, a new Chair should have some minimal time in the role prior to an early review process.

Action: PS will apply this suggestion.

Additional comment from 7.2: The term "prompt" might be defined.

Action: PS will apply this suggestion.

Additional comment from 7.2: The policy should be clarified to state that the petition signers' names are kept "confidential" only from the incumbent chair. Anyone who signs the petition will know the names of previous signatories. The dean knows the signers.

Action: PS will apply this change.

Comment: In section 11.1 "A Chair shall receive due process appropriate to the nature of the offense that justifies removal." The Senate has no right either to grant or to restrict due process. This sentence should be removed.

Action: PS committee chair will meet with provost to discuss this in more detail. A simple meeting between chair and president can outline the “due process”.

6. Following through on Program Coordinators survey

The survey will be discussed in next meeting.

7. Adjourn at 4 pm.

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – April 3, 2017 2:00PM-4:00PM

Clark 445

Chair: Ken Peter

Present: Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Hwang, Kauppila, Lee, Lessow-Hurley, Marachi, Peter, Reade

1. Information privacy policy will have a final reading at the April 10th Senate meeting. There was a brief discussion of the general principles underlying the policy. Section 1.5 was struck.

2. Chairs and Directors policy: Sections 3.1 and 3.2 were added as advised by the College Elections Committee

   Section 3.3 – Should "periodically" be defined more precisely?

   Fractional assigned time should be periodically reviewed and developed in consultation with the chair. Who would perform this review? Chairs should know in advance how much assigned time they will be granted as chairs. The dean will develop the chair's time fraction in consultation with the chair.

   Section 6.4 (extended interim chairs) – language clarified. Interim chairs do not need to be approved by departmental faculty as regular chairs do.

   Other questions raised – What if the faculty does not want an interim chair to continue but administration does? Who reports to Organization & Government?

   Alternative language was suggested for section 6.4 regarding collegial governance

   Section 7.1 – 7.2 (review of department chairs) – The committee discussed whether the time frame specified in 7.2 should be one semester or one academic year. The suggestion was made to remove the word "prompt" from 7.2 and replace it with "40 duty days" (approximately eight weeks.)

   Section 11.2 – The mention of criminal activity was struck. Several other minor language changes were suggested.

3. Intellectual Property policy: The committee will bring this Sense of the Senate resolution to the April 10th meeting.

There was a question regarding unauthorized posting of classroom materials on the internet. Faculty generally retain the rights to classroom materials they have created, with some exceptions. One of these is "extraordinary support" from the university. In the UC policy, extraordinary support is quite narrowly defined. The proposed system-wide CSU policy goes much farther – all course materials may continue to be used by the university even after the faculty member has retired or moved on, though the faculty member retains the copyright. The UC policy also draws an important distinction between "actual course materials" and "documents for course approval."

The committee is concerned that the far broader language, particularly regarding extraordinary support, in the proposed CSU policy could result in the CSU claiming ownership of a substantial number of course materials developed by CSU faculty.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Kauppila

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes
April 17th, 2017
Clark Hall 445, 2–4 pm

Attendance: Hamedi-Hagh, Hwang (Minutes), Kauppila, Lee, Marachi, Peter (Chair), Reade, and White

Absent: Caesar, Green, Lessow-Hurley (honorary Senator)

1. Call to Order at 2:00 pm

2. Minutes of April 3rd (Kauppila): Has not been delivered at the time of this meeting

3. Discussion with Dean Mary Schutten on the amendments for AS 1646

Dean Mary Schutten took PS committee through the 11 amendments offered by the Deans. To start the meeting, Dean Schutten addressed the followings:

- It's very difficult for the Deans to mandate the meetings due to faculty's teaching schedules
- Some departments do not have senior faculty to serve on its RTP committee, and/or the senior faculty are in the Faculty Early Retirement Program, therefore not eligible to serve
- The length of time to train a Chair and to get everything running, six months, is not feasible
- Hope to use electronic vote rather than paper ballot in the future

Amendment 1
Qualifications
CBA allows everyone (temp or full-time) to serve as a Chair, it should be President's call. Deans prefer to delete "in consultation with the Executive committee."
Action: PS committee approves this.

Amendment 2
Section 3.1
Who should determine and provide the Chair's job description? Deans prefer to have a generic description for the Chair, though PS committee is concerned that the Chairs will be evaluated by the generic job description. Dean Schutten responded that each department has its own Chair review process that associates with the department/program accreditation. It's up to the Chair Review committee to determine the assessment criteria for evaluating the Chair. Also, considering how complex the departments/programs are across campus, a generic job description might work best.
Action: Chair Peter will ask UCCD about where they stand with this. PS committee is not sure about this amendment and will discuss in the next meeting.

Amendment 3
Section 3.2
Deans would like to limit the College Election committee to only tenured and tenure track faculty. White asked why we open up the Chair qualification to all, but in section 3.2, we limit to only tenured and tenure track faculty. Dean Schutten's response is that not all faculty are available to attend the meetings, and the Deans would like to move the process and make decisions from there so as not to slow down the process.
Action: PS committee is okay with this.

Amendment 4
Section 3.7

We would like to open up the opportunity to all, so Faculty may nominate. Chair Peter suggests the language to "Nominated persons shall accept or decline nomination. Candidates will be given the opportunity to make statements and take questions."
Action: PS committee is okay with this.

Amendment 5
Section 3.8.3
If there are three or more candidates, Deans and PS committee are not sure about the voting methods—ranked order vs. consensus voting particularly. Dean Schutten has concerned about the ranked order voting in general. Chair Peter will ask voting experts in Political Science about how to proceed further.
Action: Some are concerned that the consensus voting is not clear, some suggest that we can let the department to choose a voting method pending on its culture. PS committee debates at length about the voting methods, and will discuss further in the next meeting.

Amendment 6
Section 3.9
Counting the votes. PS committee likes the clear language that the Deans proposed in general. Ultimately Deans would like the votes to be electronically conducted and counted.
Action: Chair Peter proposes the language—Counting the votes. The college election committee will meet to count votes. The candidates will be notified of the time and place of the count at least one day in advance, and each may send one observer (other than themselves). The committee is responsible for an accurate count and review of ballots. The committee will assure that balloting was secret, that votes are entered in the correct category, and that proper proportions are applied. The results shall be certified (signed) by the election committee. PS committee will review the draft in the next meeting.

Amendment 7a & b
Section 3.10
Forwarding the results. Deans like the phrase "Department recommendation" better—it fits well with faculty governance. Deans are not clear about what PS committee recommended—"Only the name of candidate who receives a majority of votes cast by the tenured and probationary faculty shall be recommended to the President via the College Dean as the nominee of the department." Chair Peter explained that it's the term coming from the CBA. Since we do not want the President to see the name of the losing candidate.
Action: PS committee suggests to delete the last sentence of the paragraph "The full results of the election shall be forwarded to the President to provide context for the recommendation."

Amendment 8a & b
Section 3.11
Distributing the results. Chair Peter suggests to change the last line to "The Dean forwards the results of the nominating election to the President at this time." Also, Deans are not quite clear about the language here, they are concerned about faculty governance and when the Deans get to contribute.
Action: PS committee discuss this in length and couldn't come to any agreement, we will determine this in the next meeting.

Amendment 9
Section 5.2
Deans think it's a duplication of CBA. Deans are wondering where they can contribute in this process, since it's based on what the department put forward. Deans are looking for a compromise—do the Deans have something to say in the process? Chair Peter asked what Dean Mary Schutten thinks of 5.1, and she prefers to refer to the suggestion from PS committee. Deans are asking for some help to be consulted with the President. Deans are trying to make clear so they can conduct chair reviews.

Action: Strike Section 5.2. PS committee is okay with it.

Amendment 10
Section 6.4
Extended interim Chairs. Change the language to the department faculty may make a request to the Dean to inquire into the reasons for the situation and provide a report to the department and the President.
Action: PS committee needs to meet to discuss in the next meeting.

Amendment 11
Section 9.3
Transition to a regularly appointed Chair. Change from 6 months to one year. 6 months don't allow sufficient time to review the performance of the interim Chair.
Action: Change the time to "a year." PS committee is okay with such.

4. Anthropology Guidelines
   The guidelines will be discussed in next meeting

5. Amendments to AS 1636
   The amendments will be discussed in next meeting

6. Adjourn at 4 pm

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

April 24, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Present: White, Peter, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh, Greene, Lee, Reade, Marachi, Lessow-Hurley (honorary senator)
Absent: Hwang, Kauppila

1. Call to Order at 2:00pm
2. Approval of Minutes of April 3 (Kauppila) and April 17 (Hwang). Caesar and White were absent from April 3 meeting. Passed by unanimous consensus with correction noted.
3. Discussion of Anthropology Guidelines
    a. Department addressed all concerns from committee in the updated guidelines.
    b. The hypothetical profiles appear to not align with the RTP policy.

        i. Probably do not need the teaching matrix as there is nothing unusual compared to the standard descriptors in the university policy.
        ii. Research matrix is better. External vs Internal grants should be listed separated or clarified what is meant by small and large grants. Use of And/Or under good is confusing. Presentation at conferences is included but under resources do not discuss how faculty will be able to pay for conference travel. Should the bullets under good that apply to the different disciplines of anthropology should also be under baseline and excellent?
        iii. Service section completely disregards university descriptors. Service matrix may be considered "too easy". Should they remove the service matrix.
    c. Motion: Approve anthropology guidelines with the following: Remove the matrices for teaching and service in the appendix. Keep research matrix in appendix with the changes described in Section 3.b.ii above. Vote is unanimous 8-0-0.

4. Amendments to AS 1636-discussed based on version of draft sent out for meeting based on amendments presented by deans at last senate meeting:
    a. Amendment 1: accepted by committee. Strike, “approved by the President”
    b. Amendment 2: Chairs Description….Deans do not want to vet this description with the department. Committee does not approve this and original language will be inserted. This includes restoring the original language in 3.1, 3.4, and 7.4.
    c. Amendment 3: accepted by committee
    d. Amendment 4: accepted by committee
    e. Amendment 5: made adjustments and accepted that was amicable with the deans.
    f. Amendment 6: accepted by committee
    g. Amendment 7: Made adjustments and accepted by committee
    h. Amendment 8a: accepted by committee but need to reorganize 3.9, 3.10, and 3.11 because of the associated changes.
    i. Amendment 8b: reject what the deans are requesting. Section 5.1 gives deans the ability to offer an opinion.
    j. Amendment 9: Reject what the deans are requesting. Keep Section 5.2
    k. Amendment 10: Reject what the deans are requesting. Keep O&G’s involvement in interim chairs.
    l. Amendment 11: accepted by committee with some additional language.
    m. Motion to accept as noted above. Motion passes, 8-0-0 and will move to Senate for Final Reading.
5. Planning for final meeting: May 8.
    a. Final guidelines are being expected from some departments that we will review at this meeting.
6. New Business: Discussion of Mini-reviews for RPT. With mini-reviews being 1 year reviews, a committee would only see things from Fall semesters only (such as SOTES) and therefore, would miss a lot of material from the Springs. Committee will be looking at this closer in the final meeting and looking what CBA says and look at other campuses.
7. Adjourn at 3:45pm